

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 103(a).

Applicant respectfully traverses all the outstanding rejections and requests reconsideration and withdrawal thereof in view of the following remarks.

**Amendments to the Claims**

No amendments have been made to the claims.

Therefore no new matter has been added.

No amendment or argument was made for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant had argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102**

The Office Action rejects, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), Claims 1-39 over U.S. Patent Application No. US-2002/0193139 Mildh et al. (Mildh).

In regard to independent claim 1 and similarly independent claims 9, 12, 24, 27, 31 and 33, and the claims that depend therefrom, contrary to the Examiner's allegation that all elements are disclosed by Mildh, the steps of transmitting an uplink signaling message on the radio connection, the uplink signaling message including a core network operator identifier is not. Therefore, independent claim 1, 9, 12, 24, 27, 31 and 33, and the claims that depend therefrom are in condition for allowance.

Therefore, Mildh does not disclose all of the features of independent claims 1, 9, 12, 24, 27, 31 and 33. The rejection is therefore unsupported by the art.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1- 39 and the claims that depend therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mildh is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), Claims 1-39 over U.S. Patent Application No. US-2004/0162077 Kauranen et al. (Kauranen).

In regard to independent claim 1 and similarly independent claims 9, 12, 24, 27, 31 and 33, and the claims that depend therefrom, contrary to the Examiner's allegation that all elements are disclosed by Kauranen, the steps of transmitting an uplink signaling message on the radio connection, the uplink signaling message including a core network operator identifier is not. Therefore, independent claim 1, 9, 12, 24, 27, 31 and 33, and the claims that depend therefrom are in condition for allowance.

Therefore, Kauranen does not disclose all of the features of independent claims 1, 9, 12, 24, 27, 31. The rejection is therefore unsupported by the art.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1- 39 and the claims that depend therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kauranen is respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**

The Office Action rejects, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Claims 1-39 over U.S. Patent Application No. US-2002/0193139 Mildh et al. (Mildh).

As discussed above, Mildh fails to disclose all of the features of independent claims 1, 9, 12, 24, 27, 31 and 33. Mildh provides no suggestion that the claimed subject matter is obvious in light thereof. Still further Examiner fails to provide a convincing line of reasoning as to the obviousness of the claims. The Examiner simply states that the claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Mildh. Therefore, Mildh does not disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1, 9, 12, 24, 27, 31 and 33. The rejection is therefore unsupported by the art.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1- 39 and the claims that depend therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Mildh is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Claims 1-39 over U.S. Patent Application No. US-2004/0162077 Kauranen et al. (Kauranen).

As discussed above, Kauranen fails to disclose all of the features of independent claims 1, 9, 12, 24, 27, 31 and 33. Kauranen provides no suggestion that the claimed

subject matter is obvious in light thereof. Still further Examiner fails to provide a convincing line of reasoning as to the obviousness of the claims. The Examiner simply states that the claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kauranen. Therefore, Kauranen does not disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1, 9, 12, 24, 27, 31 and 33. The rejection is therefore unsupported by the art.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1- 39 and the claims that depend therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Kauranen is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The application, and in particular claims 1-39, is in condition for allowance and a favorable response at an early date is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number indicated below. Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to **Deposit Account 502117**.

Respectfully submitted,

/DAVID S NOSKOWICZ/

David S. Noskowicz

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 55,503

Dated: 31 July 2006

Phone No. (847) 523-2333

Fax No. (847) 523-2350

Please send correspondence to:

Motorola, Inc.

Intellectual Property

600 North U.S. Highway 45

Libertyville, IL 60048